WS proposal "The diachrony of valence" (submitted to M. Cennamo on August 1, 2014)

WS organizers: Werner Abraham (University of Munich): werner_abraham@t-online.de, Elisabeth Leiss (University of Munich): elisabeth.leiss@lmu.de & Lars Hellan (University of Trondheim) lars.hellan@ntnu.no

In the 22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics (ICHL22)
Date: 27-July 2015 - 31 July 2015
Location: Naples, Italy
Contact Person: Michela Cennamo
Email: micennam@unina.it
Web Site: www.ichl22.unina.it (under construction)

Deadline for workshop proposals: 20 September 2014
Notification of acceptance of workshop proposals: 20 October 2014
Deadline for submission of abstracts for general sessions and workshops: 30 January 2015
Notification of acceptance of papers for general sessions and workshops: 30 March 2015

The diachrony of verb valence is severely underresearched. This state of research is not improving given that construction grammarians underestimate valence as some sort of idiomatized construction. From the grammarian's view, however, valence is case and semantic role government mainly by verbs, but, principally, also by other word classes. In other words, valence is classification of re-write rules according to the criteria of morphological case, semantic role, and also of necessary vs. optional governees/actants. Eventive typing (also in terms of aspect and Aktionsart valuation) is usually not included in valence classification, although it would be a valuable additional characterization. Valence thus includes not only quantitative, but also qualitative selection: a verb is characterized as to how many governees/actants are governed. This includes also the selection of the event types (of the Vendler type and beyond): deep case types, or semantic roles, in the sense of Fillmore 1968.

It is necessary to assign immediately the role that the verb-listed actant assumes in the valence frame: Thus, for example, *cut* selects an AGENT and a THEME/UNDERGOER (that which undergoes, or experiences, the event denoted by the verb) as in the structural frame: AGENT[__THEME/UNDERGOER] given that English is SVO and separates subject and object positions. The equivalent structure for German *schneiden* or Dutch *snijden* is AGENT[THEME/ UNDERGOER__] since German and Dutch are underlyingly SOV. Notice that the question whether AGENT or THEME is assigned the position of external argument/ subject in the valence frame can be derived from a universal relational hierarchy (valid for the NOMINATIVE-ACCUSATIVE L-type, but not for the ERGATIVE L-type) according to which AGENT has always priority over any other semantic role in the simple clause.

The diachrony of valence includes variation in time of valence typology in a single L as well as in L-types. Such valence diachrony can occur within one specific L and through L-contact (as in the case of pidginization or more or less related processes such as the Romanization of Old English in the historical period of the Norman invasion). In the list below we sketch processes of diachronic valence change.

Inexhaustive list of possible paths of diachronic valence research:
What can be expected in the diachrony of valence?
- Quantitative valence may change
- Qualitative valence may change
- Morphological case may change: In German, genitive valence has massively given way to other cases, predominantly to accusative. The question is whether old genitive valence has

anything to do with the partitive genitive (which occurred as a paradigmatic valence option) or whether it was a case semantics in its own right and status being lost in the further course.

- Since valence selection may be organized paradigmatically (case morphology contingent also upon aspectual value of (verbal) complement or on the choice between features such as [±human/±animate]) or syntagmatically (either independent of, or contingent upon, linear position in the clause as in Modern English) a shift from paradigmatic to syntagmatic may be a diachronic choice also.

Additional questions are:
- Since massive syntactic (multiple) fusion of (directional) prepositions (*an/ab/vor/zu/auf/ unter/über* etc.), on the one hand, and aspectual *ge-* and simple verbs took place (*ver-/ab-/vor-/bei-zer-/über-/unter*REDEN) the question rises to which systematic extent this influenced the valence of the new fused verbs. In particular, did the prepositions – themselves a governing category – merge their valence into the resulting fusional complex?
- Since prepositional fusion resulted in either (non-focal) prefixal or (focal) particle complexes, and since certain prepositions only yielded focused prefixal morphemes (*ver-SPRECHEN* "promise" vs. *VORsprechen* "drop in on"; **anSPRECHEN-ANsprechen*), the different results may require different systematic explanations.
- What is behind the generality of directional preposition+verb fusion, but not stative preposition+verb?
- Is it possible to explain case in terms of features and clear form-function relations in the vein of Jakobson 1957?
- Is there any systematics behind case selection of verba deponentia? Consider Latin *utor*+ ABLATIVE, which taken by its diathetic form should represent the original AGENT, but which, in fact, represents the direct object of the deponens verb.
- Speaking in terms of paradigms, how do languages encode causatives as opposed to decausatives, transitives as opposed to detransitives,
- Has there cross-diachronically been a blockade for doubling identical case forms? Consider German *jemanden.ACC etwas.ACC lehren; jemanden.ACC etwas.ACC kosten,* which are strictly evaded in the spoken dialects. Does this mean that morphological case raises semantic images which are un-alignable with one another in a single clause? But consider also Latin *aliquem.ACC Latinam linguam.ACC discere*, which was valid thruout Classical Latin (but perhaps not in late vulgar Latin?).
- What L-contact did and does with valence is an unwritten chapter on this topic. Contributions from pidgins and creoles would be highly welcome. This applies equally to French influence in the period of ME.
- Given the common insight that under L-contact (i.e. with pidginization and creolization) grammar is transferred to the recipient L a lot less than semantic-lexical information, what role does semantic valence play in the emerging language? Does it influence linearization in a systematic way (linearization aligning with hierarchies of semantic roles)?
- Bare datives and the pertinent prepositional constituents (as in English): simply linear alignment or semantic difference?
- Is there a particular role laid aside for the reflexive pronominal, either full or as a grammatical suffix, influencing valence emergence synchronically and diachronically? The case of deponens verbs and their semantic case distribution.
- Finally, are there instances of morphological valence encoding that are interacting with phonemic syllable status vs. desyllabification due to phonetic changes?

We invite workshop contributions in the spirit of, but also beyond, the list hereabove.

Select topical References:

Abraham, Werner. 1997. The interdependence of case, aspect, and referentiality in the history of German: the case of the genitive. In: A. van Kemenade & N. Vincent (eds.). *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*, 29-61*.* Cambridge: CUP.

Abraham, Werner. 2006. Bare and prepositional differential case marking: The exotic case of German (and Icelandic) among all of Germanic, 115-147. In: L. Kulikov, A. Malchukov & P. de Swart (eds.). *Case, valency, and transitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Abraham, Werner 2010. Misleading homonymies, economical PPs in microvariation, and P as a probe. In: G. Cinque & L. Rizzi (eds.) *Mapping spatial PPs. The cartography of syntactic structures*, 261-293. [Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Vol. 6]. Oxford: OUP.

Abraham, Werner 2010. Types of transitivity. Intransitive objects and intransitivity – and the logic of their designs: Ways to keep apart derivation in syntax and the lexicon. In: P. Brandt & M. García García (eds.) *Transitivity: form, meaning, acquisition, and processing*, 15-68. [Linguistic Aktuell /Linguistics Today 166]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Abraham, Werner & Elisabeth Leiss 2012. The case differential: Syntagmatic versus paradigmatic case – its status in synchrony and diachrony. *Transactions of the Philological Society Volume* 110: 316-341.

Abraham, Werner & Elisabeth Leiss 2015 (to appear). Syntagmatic vs. paradigmatic case – the methodology for underspecification of case exponency. In: L. Hellan; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bickel, Balthasar & Johanna Nichols 2009. Case marking and alignment. In: A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (eds.). *Handbook of Case*, 304-322. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Blake, Barry J. 2001. *Case.* 2nd edition. Cambridge: CUP.

Booij, Geert 1995. Inherent versus contextual inflection and the split morphology hypothesis. In: G. Booij & J.v. Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of morphology 1995*, 1-16. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Bossong, Georg 1985. *Empirische Universalienforschung. Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen.* Tübingen: Narr.

Bossong, Georg 1985. Markierung von Aktantenfunktionen im Guaraní. Zur Frage der differentiellen Objektmarkierung in nicht-akkusativischen Sprachen. In: F. Plank (ed.) *Relalational typology*, 1–29. Berlin: Mouton.

Bossong, Georg 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In: D. Wanner & D. Kibbee (eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics, Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages 1988*, 143-170. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bossong, Georg 1998. Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe. In: Jack Feuillet (ed.): *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, 193–258. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In: E. Bach & R. Harms (eds.) *Universals of linguistic theory.* New York: Rinehart & Winston.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1977. The case for case reopened. In: *Syntax and* semantics 8, 59-81.*.*

Hellan, Lars; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) 2015 (to appear). *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Iván, Ismael & Teomiro García 2015 (to appear). Towards a cross-linguistic classification of pronominal verbs. In: L. Hellan, Lars; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jacobs, Joachim 1992a. Syntax und Valenz. In: Hoffmann, Ludger (ed.) *Deutsche Syntax: Ansichten und Aussichten. Jahrbuch 1991 des Instituts für deutsche Sprache.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 94-127.

Jacobs, Joachim 1992 b. Bewegung als Valenzvererbung. Teil I. *Linguistische Berichte* 138, 85-122.

Kropp Dakubu, Mary Esther & Lars Hellan 2015 (to appear). A format for multi-lingual valence classification. In: L. Hellan, Lars; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lavidas, Nikolaos & Leonid Kulikov 2015 (to appear). Between passive and middle: voice and verbal classes in Greek and Sanskrit. In: L. Hellan, Lars; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leiss, Elisabeth 1992. Die *Verbalkategorien des Deutschen.*[Studia Linguistica Germanica 31]. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Malchukov, Andrej & Peter de Swart 2009. Constraints on case frames: converging approaches. In: A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (eds.) The *Oxford handbook of case*, 344-345. Oxford Handbook: OUP.

Malchukov, Andrej & Andrew Spencer (eds.) 2009. The *Oxford handbook of case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malicka-Kleparska, Anna 2015 (to appear). Circumfixed causatives in Polish against a panorama of active and non-active voice morphology. In: L. Hellan, Lars; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mel'čuk, Igor 2015 (to appear). *Semantics: from meaning to text*. Edited by David Beck and Alain Polguère. [Studies in Language Companion Series]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Melloni, Bisetto & Masini 2015 (to appear). Cognate constructions in Italian and beyond: a lexical semantic approach. (Italian; Russian, Hebrew, Romance at large). In: L. Hellan, Lars; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mounier, C. & Denis Creissels 2015 (to appear). Valency patterns in Basque. In: L. Hellan, Lars; A. Malchukov & M. Cennamo (eds.) *Verbal valency in European languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Welke, Klaus 2011. *Valenzgrammatik des Deutschen: eine Einführung*. Berlin: de Gruyter.